THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 June 1992

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes:

21 May 1992

B. Dates of next meetings:

23 July 1992
17 September 1992

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Interagency Initiative for the National Mall Road Improvement Program

CFA 18/Jun/92-1, Final draft of Streetscape Manual. (Previous: CFA 26/Jun/91-ADM.)

B. Department of the Treasury, U.S. Mint

1. CFA 18/Jun/92-2, White House Bicentennial Commemorative Silver Dollar; status report.

2. CFA 18/Jun/92-3, Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Commemorative Coins. Designs.

C. Smithsonian Institution

CFA 18/Jun/92-4, National Zoological Park. Renovation of and rear addition to existing Monkey House, including "overhead Orangutan Transit System (OTS)." Revised designs. (Previous: CFA 16/Apr/92-4.)

D. Federal Bureau of Investigation

CFA 18/Jun/92-5, J. Edgar Hoover Building, 9th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Alteration of panels at sidewalk level and ivy planting.

E. Department of the Navy, Chesapeake Division

CFA 18/Jun/92-6, Anacostia Naval Station. Child Day Care Center. Preliminary design.

F. District of Columbia Government, Department of Public Works

CFA 18/Jun/92-7, Barney Circle Bridge across the Anacostia River. Material selection. (Previous: CFA 19/Sep/91-9.)

G. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 92-20, Corcoran Gallery of Art, 530 17th Street, N.W. Proposed installation of banners; discussion.

b. Appendix I.

2. Old Georgetown Act

Appendix II.

H. Freer Gallery of Art

CFA 18/Jun/92-8, Inspection of acquisitions.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

NO	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 92-44 HPA. 92-309	2021 Belmont Road, N.W. James Nash Residence	Rear addition, property wall and terraces - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed rear addition, terraces, property wall and alterations as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 12 June 1992.

S.L. 92-49	4636 Broad Branch Road, N.W. Gelman/Salop Residence	Addition - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of addition to residence as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 10 June 1992. Suggest additional study of wall to roof proportions. Submit working drawings for review when ready.

S.L. 92-54	2135 Yorktown Road, N.W. James Rutherford Residence	New Building - conceptual

ACTION: Case superseded by case S.L. 92-77.

S.L. 92-60 HPA. 92-341 PADC 92-4	633 Indiana Avenue, N.W. Peoples Drug Store	Storefront alterations - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alteration of storefront including relocation of entrance doors. Recommend against lettering on awnings.

S.L. 92-61 HPA. 92-353	1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Peoples Drug Store	Awnings - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for shed-type awnings without chamfered corners.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 92-62 HPA. 92-354 PADC 92-5	1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. DC 1 Associates The Wall Street Deli	Awning - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed awning as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 16 June 1992. Lettering on valance is no more than 10 inches in height.

S.L. 92-64	2020 F Street, N.W. Charles E. Smith The Statesman	Alterations to entry vestibule - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to entry vestibule and new railings. Recommend separate submission with additional information for flagpoles.

S.L. 92-65 HPA. 92-367	1431 H Street, N.W. SJG Properties Nantucket Hair Salon	Sign and three flags - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed flags over entrance door and sign as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 16 June 1992.

S.L. 92-66	2301 Calvert Street, N.W. Syracuse University Office building	Repaving of rear parking area - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed repaving of rear parking area to match paved area in front of building.

S.L. 92-67	510 21st Street, N.W. Potomac Park Ltd. Part. Potomac Park Apartments	Alterations to lobby entrance - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to lobby entrance.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 92-68	6972 Oregon Avenue, N.W. William Thomas Residence	Additions - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for alterations & addition, provided new & old brick work is painted a uniform color.

S.L. 92-69	300 D Street, N.W. Washington Design Center	Addition of windows - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed addition of windows at 8th floor. Submission conforms with previously approved concept. See previous Action (S.L. 92-58).

S.L. 92-70 HPA. 92-383	201 E Street, S.E. Trustees of Amherst College Shakespeare Library	Garden walk - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed walk connecting entrance to Third Street garden.

S.L. 92-71 HPA. 92-385	2071 Park Road, N.W. Martin and Andrea Kalin Residence	Fence - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed fence.

S.L. 92-74 HPA. 92-388	2928 Macomb Street, N.W. Sheldon and Arlene Holen Residence	Rear porch and deck addition - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed screened porch and extension of deck.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 92-75	2125 E Street, N.W. Peoples Drug Store	Replacement sign - permit

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST issuance of permit for proposed new sign. Recommend maintaining and repairing existing sign.

S.L. 92-76	2525 Waterside Drive, N.W. Glavin Residence	Roof dormers - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of addition of dormer windows. Submit working drawings for review when ready.

S.L. 92-77	2135 Yorktown Road, N.W. James Rutherford Residence	New building - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new single family dwelling as shown in supplemental drawings received & dated June 1992. Material sample panel shall be erected on site for approval prior to construction.

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 92-59 HPA. 92-238	3800 Reservoir Rd., N.W. Georgetown U. Hospital Concentrated Care Center	Terrace bridges, canopy and elevator access - revised concept

ACTION: Returned without action. Case superseded by case O.G. 92-73.

O.G. 92-73 HPA. 92-283	3800 Reservoir Rd., N.W. Georgetown U. Hospital Concentrated Care Center	Terrace bridges, canopy and elevator access - revised concept

ACTION: No objection to concept design for new elevator and pedestrian bridge to terrace as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 2 June 1992. Submit working drawings for review when ready.

O.G. 92-74 HPA. 92-294	1304 Wisconsin Ave., N.W. Martin's of Georgetown	Awning - additional information - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed awning shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 9 June 1992.

O.G. 92-77 HPA. 92-285	3222 Cherry Hill Ln., N.W. Cherry Hill Associates	Fence - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed fence which should be painted. Because of configuration of fence, recommend coordination with adjacent neighbor.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 92-78 HPA. 92-312	3630 Prospect St., N.W. William McGowan Residence	Alterations and addition - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations and addition as shown in drawings received and dated 8 May 1992.

O.G. 92-80 HPA. 92-332	1729 Wisconsin Ave., N.W. Nations Bank	Sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed sign as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 11 June 1992. Lettering as shown is no-greater than 12 inches in height and covers an area less than 25 square feet.

O.G. 92-81 HPA. 92-337	3900 Reservoir Road, N.W. Georgetown University Research Building	New building - revised concept

ACTION: No objection to concept development. Submit working drawings for approval prior to permit issuance.

O.G. 92-82 HPA. 92-340	3417 P Street, N.W. Joseph Canzeri Residence	1 story addition - permit

ACTION: Returned for review by the Historic Preservation Review Board of the District of Columbia due to lack of significant visibility from public space. (Note that a number of other alterations have been made to this house without review by the Commission of Fine Arts and that the visibility of some elements has changed due to tree removal and anticipated construction on adjacent property. Thus in the interest of protecting the integrity of the review process, and in the interest of avoiding duplicate review by two bodies, the Commission recommends that the Historic Preservation Review Board, which does have jurisdiction over projects not visible from public space, review the matter.)

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 92-83 HPA. 92-342	1555 35th St., N.W. Bollenbach Residence	Alterations and additions - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for proposed renovation and additions. Submit working drawings for review when ready.

O.G. 92-85 HPA. 92-348	3140 M Street, N.W. Door Store	Alterations to storefront - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to storefront as shown in supplemental drawings (Alternative A) received and dated 15 June 1992.

O.G. 92-86 HPA. 92-349	3900 Reservoir Rd., N.W. Georgetown University Building "D"	New windows and enclosure of canopy - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of introduction of new windows nor to enclosure of existing canopy at entrance. Recommend coping match existing concrete spandrel on building. Submit working drawings when ready.

O.G. 92-87 HPA. 92-350	3203 Cherry Hill Ln., N.W. C. Gray Residence	Window replacement - permit

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST issuance of permit for proposed window replacement as submitted. Recommend resubmission of application for installation of window replacements utilizing true divided lights (muntins).

O.G. 92-76 HPA. 92-287	1658 29th Street, N.W. Joan Belin Residence	Basement windows - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed enlargement of basement windows as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 12 June 1992. Note: supplemental drawings do not include excavation for basement entrance.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS PRE-MEETING TOUR

18 June 1992

CONVENE: 8:00 AM, Pension Building, Suite 312,
441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001

1. FBI Building, enter E Street entrance, leave Pennsylvania Avenue.

2. The Mall, 17th Street between Constitution Avenue and Independence (service drive toward Lincoln Memorial North of Reflecting Pool.

3. Freer Gallery of Art, Independence Avenue side, after Commission meeting.

Members Present:

The Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman
The Hon. Neil H. Porterfield, Vice Chairman
The Hon. Joan Abrahamson
The Hon. Jeannine Smith Clark
The Hon. George Hartman
The Hon. Robert Peck

Staff Present:

Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Donald B. Myer, Asst. Secretary
Jeffrey R. Carson

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 June 1992

The meeting was convened at 10:25 in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at the Pension Building, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., after a tour of project sites.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Neil H. Porterfield, Vice-Chairman Hon. Joan Abrahamson Hon. Jeannine Smith Clark Hon. George E. Hartman Hon. Robert A. Peck
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue Kohler Mr. Jose Martinez-Canino
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	Mr. Patrick Tribe

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes of the 21 May 1992 meeting: The minutes were approved without objection.

B. Dates of next meetings. Approved as:

23 July 1992
17 September 1992

The Secretary said a change had been requested in the date of the October meeting, and he was suggesting the 29th; the November meeting would be eliminated and the final meeting of the year held on either the 3rd or the 10th of December. The October change was satisfactory to those present, and the 3rd of December considered better than the 10th.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Interagency Initiative for the National Mall Road Improvement Program

CFA 18/JUN/92-1, Final draft of Streetscape Manual. (Previous: CFA 26/JUN/91-ADM.) Staff member Jeffrey Carson recalled that this project had been going on for more than a year; he said he had been attending the meetings as the Commission's representative. He noted the Commission's support of the project, and its special interest in lighting, expressed at the June 1991 meeting. Mr. Carson then introduced the chairman of the task force, Arthur Hill, division administrator of the Department of Transportation's District of Columbia Division of the Federal Highway Administration.

Mr. Hill reviewed the history of the project, recalling that it had gotten started because of a chance remark at an embassy event, made to the head of the Federal Highway Administration, regarding the less-than-satisfactory condition of the Mall roads, and the roads and streets in the District in general. Mr. Hill said nothing much had been done until he called a meeting in 1990 to find out under whose jurisdiction the various roads and streets came. The agencies involved expressed an interest in improving the situation, not only in regard to the roads, but other streetscape elements in the Mall area, and the first formal meeting was held in February 1991. Mr. Hill said the participants in the task force could be divided roughly into two groups: the architect/engineer group and the planning/coordination group; it had been the architect/engineer group that had prepared the Streetscape Manual. He said he had been very pleased that over a dozen federal agencies had been able to work toward a common goal and produce this manual, the first step in the five-year improvement program.

Mr. Carson said he had been working especially on the Mall street vendor problem, and he expected District government legislation governing vendors would be in place by March 1993. He then noted that the Commission had seen a Park Service installation of the streetscape elements at 17th Street and Constitution Avenue, during their pre-meeting tour. He commented on the proposed halide lighting, saying that he had seen a demonstration using 175 watt bulbs, and thought they cast too much glare. He said the same wattage was used on Delaware Avenue by the Architect of the Capitol's office (which owns the fixtures under its jurisdiction) and the glare was apparent there, too. He said that in the name of safety, the District was proposing 400 watts, which seemed out of the question. Another problem regarding the lighting was the placement of the Bacon twin lamp in relation to the curb.

Traditionally, and with Commission approval, it had been placed parallel, but he said there were many recent installations where it was perpendicular to the curb; ~~and this~~ the traditional placement was the one recommended in the Streetscape Manual draft.

Mr. Carson said the Commission was being asked at this meeting to approve the draft of the Streetscape Manual with comments; he said he expected that by the next meeting of the task force, on 5 August, they would have comments from all the agencies involved.

The Chairman observed that when a light source was exposed, the street around it became dark to the observer, and not really as safe; he thought the Commission should fight for a suitable light level. Mr. Peck agreed, noting that for proper vision, the entire area would have to be floodlit or the general level of lighting kept low. The Chairman said he thought the site inspection had been very helpful. He reported that the members present thought the steel nosing on the inlet covers should be widened to equal the width of the curb, so that the line was carried through; and the simulated granite covers, where they appeared in grass panels, made darker than the granite curb, so that they would blend in better. Mr. Peck commented on the use of post and chain barriers; he said they could easily become eyesores unless well-designed and firmly placed. Mr. Carson said he thought that detail was being studied.

The general reaction to the Streetscape Manual was favorable, Mr. Hill and his task force were congratulated, and the draft was unanimously approved, with the comments noted above. Exhibit A

B. Department of the Treasury, U. S. Mint

1. CFA 18/JUN/92-2, White House Bicentennial Commemorative Silver Dollar; status report. The Secretary noted that both this submission and the following one for the Christopher Columbus coins had been brought in just a week after the May meeting, with the request that the White House coin designs be circulated to the members for their comments because of tight scheduling. He said for the record that this had been done, and the consensus was that the obverse could be approved with the following modifications: (1) the chain from which the lantern hung should be behind, not in front of, the columns; (2) the potted plants on either side of the door, the fussy landscaping, and the fountain, should be eliminated. The reverse was unanimously disapproved. It had a plaque in the center, with a quotation from a speech made by President John Adams at the dedication of the White House; an eagle holding cascading ribbons in his beak, above; and another view

of the north front of the White House below. He noted that the Mint had said a view of the south side would be substituted.

The Secretary said these designs were the choice of the Secretary of the Treasury, although he understood that the White House curatorial office and the White House Historical Association had made a different choice. He said the Commission had been shown only the designs preferred by the Treasury. He noted also that the Commission's legislation said the Secretary of the Treasury's approval should come after consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts.

Kevin Cullinane from the marketing department of the Mint was then introduced. He said the procedure was that the designs were first shown to the Secretary for his comments, then to the Commission, and then again to the Secretary with the Commission's comments, for his approval. The Chairman said he had no objection to the procedure, but the Commission should be shown all the designs shown to the Secretary and any others whose approval was required. He said that although the obverse could be approved with the modifications listed by Mr. Atherton, it would be better for the Commission to see other options for the reverse. Ms. Abrahamson agreed. The Chairman said he was on the committee for the White House bicentennial and realized the time constraints, and suggested that perhaps there could be between-meeting conferences on alternate designs. Vice-Chairman Porterfield said he would feel better if this were the exception rather than the rule, and he thought the review process worked much better when the members discussed the designs together during a meeting, rather than responding individually by mail. Exhibit B

2. CFA 18/JUN/92-3, Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Commemorative Coins. Designs. Staff member Sue Kohler said there would be three coins in this series: A five-dollar gold coin, a one-dollar silver coin, and a half-dollar clad coin. She said the legislation required that the five-dollar coin bear a likeness of Columbus, and that the other two coins be emblematic of the quincentenary of the discovery of America. The legislation also established the Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, "to encourage and support research, study, and labor designed to produce new discoveries in all fields of endeavor for the benefit of mankind." It provided that surcharges from the sale of the coins be used for the benefit of that foundation. She said the designs for the coins had all been prepared by sculptor/engravers at the Mint, and she showed the obverse and reverse of each coin. The obverse of the gold coin was designed by James Ferrell, the reverse by Thomas Rogers; John Mercanti designed the obverse of the silver coin and Thomas

Rogers the reverse; both sides of the clad coin were designed by James Ferrell.

The members then discussed each design. The obverse of the five-dollar gold coin, with the portrait of Columbus, was approved, although it was recommended that the compass be removed because it would not be intelligible on so small a coin. For the same reason, it was requested that the number of elements on the reverse be reduced, leaving only the old map with the compass in the center.

The obverse of the one-dollar silver coin, showing a standing figure of Columbus, was approved. The reverse, a split design showing half of one of Columbus's ships on the left and half a rocket ship on the right, was disapproved. It was not considered capable of modification, and a new design was requested. A suggestion was made that if the idea of contrasting ways of exploration in 1492 and 1992 was one the Mint wanted to pursue, then they might try placing the ship in the background in low relief, with the rocket in front of it.

The obverse of the half-dollar clad coin presented problems, not because of the design but because of the subject matter. The depiction of Columbus and his men in the presence of the Indians, with the word "Liberty" around the edge of the coin, did not seem a wise choice in light of subsequent history. It was suggested that "Liberty" be moved to the other side of the coin, or the subject matter altered. The reverse design showed Columbus's three ships at sea and the inscription, "500th Anniversary of Columbus' Discovery". There were no objections to the design, but it was thought that the sails should be rendered as full of wind, to match the apparent speed of the ships. Also, it was suggested that "Discovery" be replaced by another, less controversial, word. Mr. Cullinane said he would take the Commission's suggestions back to the Mint. Exhibit C

C. Smithsonian Institution

CFA 18/JUN/92-4, National Zoological Park. Renovation of and rear addition to existing Monkey House, including "overhead Orangutan Transit System (OTS)." Revised designs. (Previous: CFA 16/APR/92-4.) Staff member Jose Martinez reviewed the Commission's comments on the previous design, a stucco-faced rear addition, which was considered incompatible with the historic, Romanesque-style Monkey House. He recalled that the suggestion had been made to follow, instead, the metal and glass aesthetic of the new cage area in front of the building. Mr. Martinez then introduced Dr. Michael Robinson, director of the National Zoo.

Dr. Robinson said he thought the renovations and additions to the Monkey House would make it a most exciting example of new trends in animal exhibitry. He said he liked the new design and the "Brunel-like" additions. He added that this would probably be the last building program for the Zoo for awhile, because of budget problems.

Joseph Weiss, the architect, was then introduced. He said he had looked at a number of different possibilities for the addition since the April meeting, and had studied Hornblower & Marshall's original 1904 drawings for the Monkey House, which had provided clues for the revised design. The new drawings showed a metal and glass, conservatory-type rear addition, with the same aesthetic followed for the enclosed yard areas in front. The additions were squared-off instead of curved, as before. He said the existing cages in the front had a roll-top roof, a concept that would be retained. He pointed out the wire mesh enclosure for the Macaque yard and the truss that would support it, as well as the support structure for the beginning of the OTS. He also noted an L-shaped stone tree well at the corner of the building, added to protect existing trees in that area.

Landscape architect Nancy Denney showed the revised landscape plans. She pointed out new walkways, providing easier access to the invertebrate exhibits and the parking area, and new stone seating areas. She said no major trees would be lost, and a number of smaller ones would be relocated. Turning to the OTS design, she said it was now lower and shorter and more integrated with the architecture. She showed drawings of the support structures, noting that the lower 18 foot section had been designed to look like a garden trellis and would have vines growing on it; above it was an electrified grid ending short of the platform, on which were the posts for attaching the vinyl-covered steel cables. The overall height would be 44 feet; 36 feet to the platform. More space had been allowed around the supports, to keep people away. The area underneath the OTS would be kept open and planted primarily with a groundcover; Ms. Denney said specific plant material had not yet been chosen.

Mr. Hartman said he liked the new design, but cautioned that the details must be consistent with the overall concept. His one concern was the dominance, in plan, of the keeper access between the two front enclosures. Mr. Weiss said this walkway was also a separation between two different exhibits and would have glazed walls on both sides. He said it would not show on the exterior, but he would see if it could be narrowed slightly. The Chairman said he was not sure about the free-standing stone tree well; he thought it was strange to see this appear suddenly in the middle of a glass and steel facade. He suggested that if it were curved and thinner it

would seem less related to the orthogonal nature of the rest of the facade and more plausible, and the members agreed. Ms. Abrahamson said she thought the design had improved 100 percent over the previous submission; the other members agreed, and the concept design was unanimously approved.

Exhibit D

D. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation

CFA 18/JUN/92-5, J. Edgar Hoover Building, 9th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Alteration of panels at sidewalk level and ivy planting. Assistant Secretary Donald Myer noted for the record that the members had visited the building on their pre-meeting tour and been briefed on the project by the FBI. He said the bureau wanted to remove the existing panels (containing historical information on several of the Presidents) and replace them with polished green granite; the second part of the submission was to plant ivy at the terrace level and let it cascade down the front of the building. The ivy would be illuminated by lights concealed behind a bronze band. Mr. Myer then introduced John Hicks from the FBI to carry on the discussion.

Mr. Hicks said the FBI had been working closely with PADC, and there was agreement on the ivy and the bronze band, but not on the granite, although PADC did agree the existing panels should be removed. Mr. Hicks said FBI Director Sessions liked the granite, which was similar to what was used in the courtyard of the building.

The Chairman said he thought the green was good in the courtyard, where it was read as a kind of memorial panel, but he thought that if it were used as part of the building, it would be outside the palette of the exterior colors--the concrete and the red paving--and also too shiny. He thought that if they wanted stone, it should be a dark granite in the red range, flame- or rough-finished; another possibility would be to have an artist do a textured concrete design. He commented that the bronze relief sculpture proposed several years ago by former Commission member Frederick Hart would be even better, but it would probably be too expensive.

Chairman Brown then noted that the original concept was to have retail shops on the ground floor of all the Pennsylvania Avenue buildings, to bring some life to the Federal Triangle area after dark. He said PADC had suggested lighted kiosks coming out perpendicular to the facade, to add a little sparkle; another possibility would be display windows, but he understood the FBI would not agree to that. Other options would be to place potted espaliered trees in each panel, or use some of the panels to tell the story of the FBI. He noted that the Commission staff had suggested glazing

the terraces and using the space for offices, rather than leaving them as they were, dark and unused. He said NCPC had asked, early in the development of the Pennsylvania Avenue plan, for viewing platforms (for the inaugural parades) on all new buildings on Pennsylvania Avenue; this was the reason for the existence of those on the FBI building. He said, however, that this was a separate question, and asked for comments on the ivy and the granite panels.

Mr. Hartman said the biggest problem was not being able to put shop fronts in the panel areas; he thought the FBI should be approached again on this matter. Mr. Hicks said the south light would be very hard on any type of display, making frequent change necessary; this was more of a problem than security. The Chairman agreed that the displays would have to be carefully maintained and that light was a problem, but he thought a solution should be sought because they would help the image of the FBI. Mrs. Clark suggested using awnings. Mr. Peck said the building was very large and brutal and needed a "welcoming sign". He thought Director Sessions should be asked again about putting real shops in, not just shop fronts, before any further decisions were made, but he stressed that the shops should not detract from the character of the building or the "straight-laced" image of the FBI. Ms. Abrahamson observed that the FBI building was a very popular place, and shops would be a help to tourists waiting for tours. Vice-Chairman Porterfield thought the urban design of that part of Pennsylvania Avenue, and specifically the area between the facade of the FBI building and the curb, should be looked at carefully in considering any changes; he thought the current panel proposal would just make the columns look excessively thin.

The Chairman told Mr. Hicks that the panel proposal was disapproved, and the ivy, while not perfect, would help soften the building and was approved. Mr. Peck asked if PADC could do anything about the shop front problem. Jay Brodie, executive director of PADC, was present; he said his organization had already done a number of studies, and he would be willing to devote additional staff time to it. He thought, however, that the problem should be discussed with Director Sessions, and he suggested that the Commission approach him. The Chairman agreed this was something the Commission could do. Exhibit E

E. Department of the Navy, Chesapeake Division

CFA 18/JUN/92-6, Anacostia Naval Station. Child Day Care Center. Preliminary design. Mr. Martinez pointed out the site on an aerial photograph, noting that it was across from Buzzard's Point and now empty. He showed a plan--four

groups of rooms on either side of a long corridor--as well as elevation drawings of the one-story, 320-foot-long structure, which would accommodate 300 children. He then introduced Larry Earle from the Navy to continue the presentation. Mr. Earle said the material would be concrete, with a split-face finish and lighter banding. The standing seam roof would be painted blue. In answer to Mrs. Clark's question, he said each room would have a door to the outside play areas. The children would range in age from infants to preschoolers. He pointed out the skylit all-purpose rooms on each side of the 6-foot-wide corridor. When questioned about visibility from the other side of the river, Mr. Earle said it would be minimal because of the berming and the low, 18-foot height. He showed slides of the site, at the north end of the Naval Station, and said the entire vacant area around it was being reserved for "people" functions.

Ms. Abrahamson remarked on the beauty of the site and said it deserved a better building. Mr. Peck observed that the whole waterfront had been diminished by nondescript buildings, and they seemed to keep coming. Mr. Hartman agreed, noting that this would be the first building in the area and would set the tone for others to follow. The Secretary commented that the Commission had seen much better day care center designs, for example, the Pentagon and the Department of Energy; he characterized this design as a brutally-organized series of rooms along a corridor. Mr. Hartman said the Navy children were entitled to a better facility and the city to a better building. The concept design was unanimously disapproved. Exhibit F

F. District of Columbia Government, Department of Public Works

CFA 18/JUN/92-7, Barney Circle Bridge across the Anacostia River. Material selection. (Previous: CFA 19/SEP/91-9.) Assistant Secretary Myer reviewed the Commission's approval of the bridge designs and the area around it--improvements to Barney Circle, the freeway, etc. He showed photographs of the plans and renderings. He said both the steel and concrete versions were still valid, as bids had to be obtained for a design in each material. He introduced Tom Burke from the District Government to continue the presentation.

Mr. Burke first discussed the dilemma of getting pedestrians, bicyclists, and Park Service maintenance vehicles across the railroad. He said the vehicle problem had been solved by an agreement with Conrail to rebuild a crossing near the bridge abutment. He recalled the previous overpass design, objected to by the Commission, and discussed the engineering and safety problems associated with trying to go

under the railroad as proposed. He said that since the number of persons using the overpass would be small, it had been suggested that it be eliminated, and users simply cross the Sousa Bridge and then come back over the Barney Circle Bridge. The Chairman said he thought this would be an acceptable way to solve the problem and avoid the expense and unattractive appearance of the huge overpass structure previously proposed.

John McLeod then discussed the granite ashlar walls to be used in conjunction with the bridge. He said the first stone selected was too bland, and they were now proposing a darker stone with a rougher face. He showed photographs of a section of a wall as it would be laid up. There was a discussion among the Chairman, Mr. Hartman and Mr. McLeod about the shapes of the stones and the way they would be placed in relationship to each other, with the feeling that the design was progressing well.

John Formosa discussed the coating that was being considered for the steel. It was a new product, 90 percent zinc with the addition of a small amount of glass. Because of the high amount of zinc, it came in only one color: a medium, bluish grey. Mr. Formosa said it was extremely durable, lasting twenty-five years with no maintenance. The members had no objection to the color and thought it would be a good choice, perhaps better than the light color paint presently specified for bridges.

The last item discussed was the roadway barriers. Mr. Burke recalled the Commission's dissatisfaction with the Jersey barriers proposed and said they had replaced those on the outer edges of the roadway with steel barriers, but could not use these in the center because they were not strong enough. The Chairman said the problem with the Jersey barriers was that the concrete always looked so crude; he wondered if it could be mixed with ashlar powder from the walls, or if the barriers could be faced with stone. He thought a metal cap might help, too. Mr. Burke said they would study the possibilities.

There was no further discussion, the members were encouraged by what they had seen, and Mr. Peck said he would like to congratulate Mr. Burke and his group on their concern for the aesthetics of this bridge. Exhibit G

(Mrs. Clark left the meeting at this point.)

G. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 92-20, Corcoran Gallery of Art, 530 17th Street, N.W. Proposed installation of banners; discussion. The Assistant Secretary introduced David Levy, director of the Corcoran Gallery, who noted that the material reviewed informally by the Commission at the April meeting was incorrect and should not have been submitted. He said the Corcoran's problem was that the name of the gallery had never been placed anywhere on the building, and it needed some identity. Tourists, for example, looked down 17th Street from Pennsylvania Avenue and thought the Corcoran was just another in a series of public buildings in the area. He stressed that he was not trying to "improve" what he recognized as a very handsome building; his effort was directed only at making people realize that it did house an art museum. He showed his proposals: a series of vertical, colored banners attached at right angles to the 17th Street facade of the building; the name "Corcoran" would be spelled out on the end banners only. Mr. Levy said banners announcing exhibitions would continue to be placed on the curved corner of the building.

There was general concern about placing banners across the strong, blank facade of this landmark building. Mr. Peck did not like the way they interrupted the clerestory, but Mr. Levy thought the proportion would be wrong if they were made shorter. The Chairman suggested that one on either side of the door would suffice; more would be detrimental to the appearance of the White House area. Mr. Hartman thought one could be put at each end of the building, thereby avoiding the clerestory; Mr. Peck agreed. Mr. Levy said he would like to experiment with mock-ups. This was considered a good way to proceed, but the Chairman summarized the sense of the Commission, that it was not approving more than two banners. Exhibit H

(Ms. Abrahamson left the meeting near the end of the Corcoran discussion.)

b. Appendix I. There was some discussion about S.L. 92-54, a house at 2135 Yorktown Road, N.W., specifically about the proposed double-glazed windows, to which an architect in the community objected. The members said they would not find them appropriate on an old house in a historic district, such as Georgetown, but would not object to their use on this new residence, especially since they would have no impact on Rock Creek Park. The rest of the Appendix was approved.

2. Old Georgetown Act
Appendix II. The Appendix was approved without objection.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m., and the Commission left for an inspection at the Freer Gallery.

H. Freer Gallery of Art

CFA 18/JUN/92-8, Inspection of acquisitions. The members inspected a number of objects proposed for acquisition and approved them.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT A

1 July 1992

Dear Mr. Hill:

The Commission was pleased to meet with you on 18 June 1992 for a formal review of the proposed Interagency Mall Streetscape Manual. The members commend your effort on the Mall Road Improvement Program, noting the especially difficult task of melding various agencies with often disparate agendas into one constructive body.

As you know, prior to the meeting the Commission visited 17th Street between Constitution and Independence Avenues where the Park Service is completing the last touches on upgrading the roadway and adjoining walk-ways in the manner described in the Manual. This inspection provided an excellent opportunity to judge first-hand the effect of the various components illustrated, resulting in the general approval of the Streetscape Manual draft. However, several details deserve further consideration.

As a rule, the linear aspects of a street should always be reinforced whenever possible. Though subject to interruption, curbs are an obvious opportunity. With respect to the 17th Street upgrade, however, the inlet covers for the catch basins are overly disruptive. The covers conform to the Manual specifications for continuous curbside tree lawns in that they are cast stone simulating the granite curb with a protective steel nosing roughly half the width of the curb. For the purpose of continuity, the Commission recommends changing the Manual by increasing the width of the steel nosing to align with the width of the curbstone and darkening the color of the cast stone cover to blend in with the adjacent grass and the iron access grate. This will help to soften necessary interruptions in the curb line. (The members were pleased to note that elsewhere the covers are aggregate-finished where they intersect the sidewalk.)

Aside from this, the most important concern involved street lighting. For many years (decades really) the Commission has advocated a parallel orientation to the curb for the Twin Twenties (again, that linear reinforcement) rather than perpendicular to the curb, as suggested in the Manual. This is no idle whim. Rather, there is a very practical reason--which is that much greater light is shone on both sidewalk and roadway. Henry Bacon designed the

lights, carefully considering every aspect of the standards, while serving as a member of the Commission of Fine Arts. The Twin Twenties were meant to be parallel to the curb, and we strongly recommend they stay that way.

On this subject, we come to the crux of the problem. All participants seem to agree that the most satisfactory light source is metal halide. The problem, however, appears to be centered on choosing a uniform wattage that will be both aesthetically pleasing as well as cost and security effective. The Commission agrees with the National Park Service; 100 watt metal halide fixtures will be sufficient in terms of aesthetics and safety, in effect providing a soft, pervasive non-glare light. It is this potential for glare that makes a fixture less safe as the light intensity increases. A 175 watt metal halide fixture is intense enough to produce a narrow zone of glare that actually appears to darken the surrounding area by contrast, a dangerous consequence for the pedestrian. Similarly, a 400 watt fixture (advocated by some District officials) provides the intensity required for a sixty-foot mast spaced 200 feet apart along a superhighway. Placing such a fixture at street level in an urban setting would be disastrous on every level.

These caveats aside, again accept the congratulations of the Commission. We look forward to continuing interagency participation and the opportunity to review the completed Manual in the near future.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Arthur Hill
Chairman
District of Columbia Division
Federal Highway Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
Union Center Plaza, Suite 750
820 First Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT B

1 July 1992

Dear Mr. Essner:

The Commission of Fine Arts was pleased to review designs for the White House Bicentennial Commemorative Coin, at its meeting on 18 June, with Mint representative Kevin Cullinane.

The obverse was approved with the following comments: (1) The chain from which the lantern is suspended must be behind, not in front of, the columns. (2) The two potted trees on either side of the door, the shrubbery and trees on the lawn, and the fountain should be removed, as they will only make the design confusing and detract from the architecture of the White House when reduced to coin size. We understand from your letter that revisions along these lines are already planned.

The reverse was not acceptable. The design--with the eagle and plaque weighing down on the White House--was disturbing, and the text of the plaque was thought to be a poor choice in today's gender-conscious society. If the exterior of the building must be shown again, it should be the south front, as you note in your letter.

As you know, late in the afternoon following our meeting, your office brought over an alternative design for the reverse side showing a doorway of the White House together with a profile of the architect James Hoban. Both of these images are included in William Seale's volumes on the White House and seem most appropriate. We also understand this design was favored by the Curator's office and staff of the White House Historical Association. At your office's request this design was circulated to our members for comment, and we now have a consensus for its approval. A suggestion to modify slightly the figure of Hoban and add his name has already been transmitted to Mr. Cullinane.

I would like to say once again, that as a general rule, the Commission would like to see all the designs for proposed coins and medals that have been prepared by the

Mint staff, not just the one or two favored by the Secretary after the fact, as it were. The authorizing legislation, I should emphasize, states that the Secretary defer his opinion until after consultation with the Commission.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Eugene Essner, Acting Director
United States Mint
633 Third Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20220

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT C

1 July 1992

Dear Mr. Essner:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its 18 June meeting, reviewed obverse and reverse designs for three coins commemorating the Christopher Columbus Quincentenary. The comments were as follows:

Five dollar gold coin

Obverse: The members were pleased with the portrait, but because of the small size of the coin, thought the compass should be removed. Reverse: Again, there were too many elements. It was recommended that the crest be removed, keeping just the map with the compass on it.

One dollar silver coin

Obverse: The design was approved. Reverse: The split-image idea was not considered successful, and it was not approved. If you want to keep the same theme, other ways to express it should be studied; one suggestion was that one of Columbus's ships might be shown in low relief behind the rocket. The globe should be eliminated because it will not be intelligible at coin size.

Half dollar clad coin

Obverse: There were questions raised here about the theme--Columbus and the Indians--and its association with the word "Liberty", in light of subsequent history. Perhaps "Liberty" could be moved to the reverse, or the subject matter altered. Reverse: Similarly, the use of the word "Discovery" did not seem a wise choice in today's world. In regard to design, the sails need to be rendered as full of wind, to match the apparent speed of the ships.

The staff will be happy to look at revisions to the designs when they are ready.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Eugene H. Essner, Acting Director
United States Mint
633 Third Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20220

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT D

1 July 1992

Dear Mr. Robinson:

The Commission was pleased to meet with you 18 June 1992 to discuss the revised designs for the renovation of and addition to the Monkey House, as well as the developmental studies for the Orangutan Transit System (OTS). The Commission's general enthusiasm reflects the appreciation of the more traditional stylistic approach to the rear addition and outdoor enclosures, as well as the simplification of the OTS system and the articulated supports. These design changes are more in keeping with the architectural quality of the historic structure.

There were two concerns expressed, however: 1) the masonry "ell" interrupting the glass wall of the Orangutan exhibit may appear too distracting; and 2) the keepers' access between the two outdoor exhibits appears too dominant, possibly the result of its awkward geometry and relationship to the existing building. We recommend further study of both.

The members are in full support of the direction the Zoo is taking and look forward to the continued enhancement of one of our most preeminent zoological parks.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Dr. Michael Robinson
Director
National Zoological Park
Smithsonian Institution
3000 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20560

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT E

1 July 1992

Kitt -

Dear Mr. Sessions:

The Commission of Fine Arts was happy to meet with Mr. Hicks at its 18 June 1992 meeting to discuss proposed changes to the Pennsylvania Avenue facade of the FBI headquarters building that have been jointly developed between your agency and PADC. We are sympathetic to the concerns for the harsh appearance of the building, but we feel that anything short of a major intervention in terms of use is probably going to have only marginal effects for the better.

As a short-term effort, the introduction of planters filled with ivy at the terrace level will probably be a help, as will the addition of a bronze lighting strip, so we have no objection to going ahead with this work. The placement of dark green granite in the sidewalk-level panels between columns is not recommended, however. We do concur in the removal of the painted historical panels currently in place.

In the long run, we believe that there are two things that could make a big difference to the forbidding and hostile character of the present scene. One is the introduction of some kind of enclosed activity in the panels facing the avenue. The other involves the terrace level void that probably accounts for much more of the problem than the blank panels at the sidewalk. As you may know, the original Pennsylvania Avenue plan called for this so-called "viewing platform" to extend all the way from Sixth to Fifteenth Street. Unfortunately this ill-conceived notion found its way into plans for the FBI Building before it was finally put to rest, and as a result your building has a vast and depressingly dark and wasteful void that permeates the entire facade. The best thing that could happen to it would be to enclose it with glass and convert it to a mixture of one and two-level spaces for visitors and office functions alike. It bears your most careful consideration.

We know these ideas and possibly others may be beyond immediate resolution, but we feel they ought to be discussed; and I would truly like to do so with you personally at your convenience. I plan to be in Washington all July. Given the dimension of the problem and the

possibilities for making a major contribution to the Avenue, the Commission feels such discussions would be very much in order.

We look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. William Sessions
Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
J. Edgar Hoover F.B.I. Building
Room 7176
9th & Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20535

I'll be calling in hopes we can get together shortly on this . . .

C.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT F

1 July 1992

Dear Mr. Faught:

During its meeting of 18 June 1992, the Commission reviewed a preliminary design for the Child Development Center at the Naval Station, Anacostia. The opinions expressed by the members were not encouraging. Rather than fussing with details, the Commission recommends a study of different options, with respect to both design and format. There are several local examples of child day care centers built by the federal government that combine consideration of the site with the needs of very small children.

Apparently, the Center will be the first building on this part of the base. As such, it will be the key to future development. Every opportunity should be taken to make sure it provides a worthy example.

As always, the Commission will work closely with you and offers the assistance of the staff should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. W.D. Faught
Director, Installation Planning Division
Department of the Navy
Chesapeake Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Building 212, Washington Navy Yard
Washington, D.C. 20374-2121

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

1 July 1992

EXHIBIT G

Dear Mr. Burch:

The Commission met with Tom Burke on 18 June 1992 to discuss design developments and materials for the Barney Circle bridge project. Both the rugged granite ashlar proposed for walls, presented by John McLeod, and the paint color, discussed by John Formosa, were enthusiastically approved. The granite will provide a handsome alternative to the spotty stonework on nearby retaining walls while offering a material which is appropriate and compatible with nearby bridges. Should the new structure end up being built of steel, the new paint or coating color has advantages over the lighter gray paint used previously which has a tendency to show stains, imperfections, and unflattering reflections. The Commission is very much in favor of trying the new color.

The center barricade remains a disturbing element. This typical "Jersey Barrier" does not live up to the design care and detailing of the rest of the project and warrants another look. A number of possibilities were discussed, including a stone facing, or a new top profile. Caps and top-rails were also mentioned, but the Commission is in no position to design the barricade, nor to assess its cost. However, we find the "Jersey Barrier" aesthetic, with the connotations of ad-hoc construction sites or temporary usage, objectionable and a design issue of genuine concern.

A final concern is over-loading the new bridge with large interstate highway signs. Keeping them off the Anacostia and Potomac crossings is critical to retaining the special character of Washington. Also, over-sized signs and their hardware do not belong suspended over monumental avenues in the L'Enfant city either. As we have previously noted, the installation of the large overhanging signs at Massachusetts and Fourth, N.W., was a mistake which needs to be rectified, not duplicated.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Gary A. Burch, Administrator
Department of Public Works
2000 14th Street, N.W., 5th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20009

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT H

1 July 1992

Dear David:

Thank you for joining the Commission to discuss the Corcoran Gallery of Art banner project on 18 June 1992. A site visit earlier in the day had convinced the Commission that lining the 17th Street facade with banners, however well designed, would be too much for a building of such unique architectural and historic quality. Although there could be acceptable options yet to emerge, the sense of the meeting was that the Commission would support, for the time being, the installation of the two end banners. This would give everyone at least a partial mock-up of your current proposal and a basis for judging the effect that the additional banners might have.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. David C. Levy
President and Director
Corcoran Gallery of Art
500 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

- the cause of having such a great [illegible]